DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 913 UD 025 599

AUTHOR Haynes, Norris M.; And Others
TITLE School Development Program, Benton Harbor, Michigan. Process Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Child Study Center.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 30p.; For related documents, see UD 025 596-598.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Attendance; Change Strategies; *Desegregation Plans; Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; School Effectiveness; School Surveys; *Self Concept; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan (Benton Harbor)

ABSTRACT

This study gathered information and perceptions regarding the School Development Program's (SDP) history, structure and procedures within the Benton Harbor Area School District (Michigan). The study sample included 46 people. SDP was created to be part of a comprehensive desegregation/educational improvement program for the district. Using a field survey and a structured interview approach, the study found a general perception that student achievement is improving, school climates are becoming more positive, parents and teachers are finding more avenues of communication and the decisionmaking processes are becoming more democratic in SDP schools. The most frequently mentioned obstacle to the achievement of SDP goals was a general resistance to change among the school staff. The second most frequently mentioned obstacle was a perception that procedures and expectations were unclear. The report also discusses study design, method, and analysis. An appendix includes the interview protocol and tables with response information. The predominant attitude about the SDP seems to be one of cautious optimism. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283913

5-21-87

PROCESS EVALUATION REPORT

on the

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

BENTON HARBOR, MICHGIAN

Norris M. Haynes, James P. Comer, Muriel Hamilton-Lee

James M. Boger, Edward Joyner

Yale University

Child Study Center

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norris Haynes

Yale Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD 025 599

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors of this report express their profound and sincere thanks to Ms. Erma Mitchell, Director of the School Development Program for the Benton Harbor Area Schools, her assistants, Ms. Kathy Kussy and Mary Gulledge, who helped to facilitate the schedule of interviews and provided the necessary logistical support.

Special thanks are expressed to the Superintendent of Schools, Mr. Harry Stephens, for supporting this project and for being available to be interviewed. A special note of thanks is also expressed to Dr. Anna Chandler, Director of Elementary Education and Dr. Wahbah Sayegh, Director of Evaluation, for their support.

The authors acknowledge the valuable contribution of students from Andrews University, Derrick Burgess, Elizabeth Parker and Jean Lawrence, who assisted in conducting interviews.

Most importantly, the authors express profound gratitude to the participants including central and school level staff, as well as parents who kindly agreed to be interviewed.

Finally, to Mrs. Shirley Ryan, much gratitude is expressed for the offering of her professional expertise and skill in painstakingly editing and typing this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Study Design	1
III. Method	1
A. Sample	1
B. Instruments	2
C. Procedure	2
IV. Analysis	3
V. Findings	3
A. Descriptive Analysis	3
1. History	3
2. SDP Goals and Organization: District Level	6
3. SDP Goals and Organization: School Level	8
4. SDP Training	10
B. Perceptions Analysis	10
1. Central Office Personnel	11
a. SDP Goals	11
b. Incorporation of SDP into District Functions	12
c. Progress of SDP in the District	12
2. School Personnel and Parents	14
a. School Level Changes Due to SDP	14
b. Impact of SDP on Schools	15
c. Obstacles	16
d. Role Perceptions	17
3. Assessment of SDP Training	18
VI. Summary	18
Appendix	20

I. Introduction

During the spring of 1986, a study was conducted in Benton Harbor, Michigan, to examine the implementation of the School Development Program (SDP) within the Benton Harbor Area School District. The purpose of this study was to gather information and perceptions regarding the program's development, structure and procedures in order to provide a better understanding of its background and current functioning. It is hoped that such an understanding will prove helpful to local personnel in Benton Harbor -- central office and building administrators, teachers, support staff and parents -- and to the Yale Child Study SDP staff for cooperative planning of future directions for the SDP.

II. Study Design

The basic study design was to conduct a field survey, utilizing a structured interview approach. A quota sampling technique was used to select participants from among the several groups who are involved in the SDP at the local level: central office administrators, school principals, teachers, support staff and parents.

III. Method

A. Sample

The study sample included a total of 46 people (see Table 1):

-Thirteen central office administrators, including the Superintendent; SDP Director; SDP Consultant; Directors of Elementary Education, Personnel, Special Education, State and Federal Programs, Reading and Research; Coordinator of Staff Development; and district-wide Social Worker, Nurse and Teacher consultant;

-Six school principals;

-Sixteen teachers;

-Eight parent members of SDP committees or teams; and

-Three school support personnel (psychologists or social workers).

The sample included at least four persons from each of the seven elementary schools that were actively involved in the SDP in Benton Harbor during the 1985-86 school year.

B. Instruments

The interview protocols used in the study were developed specifically for documentation of the School Development Program by the SDP research staff at the Child Study Center (see Appendix A). The areas of inquiry included:

1. SDP History (in Benton Harbor)
2. Information Dissemination
3. District and SDP Organizational Structure and Goals
4. School-level SDP Implementation Status
5. SDP Training (in New Haven)

C. Procedure

Permission to conduct the study by carrying out structured interviews was obtained from the Superintendent of Benton Harbor Area Schools and scheduling arrangements were made with the cooperation and assistance of the local SDP Director and her staff.

Interviewers included two SDP staff persons from the Child Study Center. Interviews took place from May 12 to 21, 1986. Central Office personnel were interviewed at their offices; school personnel and parents at their respective schools. At the discretion of each interviewee, most interviews were taped.

Responses were tabulated and analyzed by the SDP research staff at the Child Study Center.

IV. Analysis

Data analysis was conducted in two parts: the descriptive analysis and the perceptions analysis. The former was based on responses to interview questions regarding: (1) SDP history, (2) district level SDP goals and organization, (3) school level SDP goals and organization, and (4) SDP training. The latter was based on responses to interview questions regarding central office respondents' perceptions of: (1) SDP goals, (2) incorporation of the SDP into district functions, (3) progress of the SDP in the district as a whole; and school personnel and parents' perceptions of: (1) school level changes due to the SDP, (2) the impact of SDP on the schools, (3) obstacles, and (4) role perceptions.

V. Findings

A. Descriptive Analysis

1. History

The School Development Program was initiated in the Benton Harbor Area Schools District in early 1981. It was specifically identified in a court order issued by the Federal District Judge for western Michigan, Douglas Hillman, to be part of a comprehensive desegregation/educational improvement program for the entire school district. As stated by several respondents to our interview, the motivation for introducing the SDP into the district was the recognition that a desegregation plan in an area with a high concentration of minority students must strike a balance between bussing students in order to integrate the schools and improving educational services in all schools, regardless of their level of integration. As one respondent stated, the judge knew that "desegregation should be more than merely mixing kids; it should enhance the entire education system."

The specific model selected by the judge, created and developed by Dr. James P. Comer of the Yale University Child Study Center, is based on the theory that academic improvement is closely associated with improved social behavior among students and more cooperation, communication and shared governance among a school's staff and parents. This SDP model was seen as the approach which best addressed the academic and behavior problems in Benton Harbor and was therefore selected for implementation.

After consultations between Dr. Comer, Judge Hillman and then superintendent James Hawkins, preparation for adopting the SDP in Benton Harbor was begun in the summer of 1981 by way of selecting a local school administrator to receive training in New Haven during the 1981-82 school year. The goal of this training experience was to provide an in-depth exposure to the SDP and its operation in the city where it was originated so that the trainee could return to her home district as a change agent to replicate the program there. During her nine-month stay in New Haven, the trainee, Mrs. Erma Mitchell, took part in numerous activities to better understand both the theoretical and practical aspects of the SDP.

The theoretical background for the SDP was discussed through consultations with Dr. Comer and New Haven Public Schools personnel who had been involved in the program, as well as through enrollment in several child development and child mental health seminars of the Yale School of Medicine. These classes and discussions focused on the importance of basing any educational improvement process on a clear understanding of the growth and development phases and needs of young children and the social/emotional background of the specific children to be served.

The practical training was carried out through observation of existing SDP programs, discussion and cooperative work assignments with other

educators who had received training and were working as administrators in the New Haven school system and direct involvement with a New Haven school that was already involved in the process. By discussing the practical applications of SDP in New Haven with Dr. Comer and former trainees, Mrs. Mitchell's task was to begin translating the process into an implementation plan appropriate for Benton Harbor.

Upon her return home, during the summer of 1982, Mrs. Mitchell and Dr. Hawkins, along with other key administrators, continued the planning process and four schools were selected to become part of SDP during the 1982-83 school year: Calvin Britain, Fairplain East, Hull and Morton. During the first year of school-level operations, a city-wide Urban Academy was also initiated. This component of the SDP process was to serve as a coordinating body to assist principals and central office administrators to implement SDP planning and activities at the school level.

During the 1984-85 school year, another three schools became part of the SDP process: Bard, Martindale and Sterne Brunson. These new schools were selected on the basis of interest expressed by their principals to participate in the SDP process, as well as demographic characteristics of the students (low income) and general characteristics of the schools (low achievement scores, observed behavior problems, low staff morale and/or negative interactional climates). The decisions were made through the joint work of the superintendent, the Urban Academy, and the SDP Director, as well as through discussions with principals who were interested in the program.

The seven schools which were participating in SDP at the time of the staff interviews for this report (spring 1986) had student bodies that

were between 75% and 95% black. Words generally used to describe them included: "inner-city," "lowest achieving, lowest SES (socio-economic status)," "low achievement, poor behavior, lack of teacher morale and low parent participation." At each school, the various components of SDP were organized around the specific needs identified by staff and participating parents, with guidance and consultation offered by the SDP Director and her staff. Specific implementation functions of the schools are described below in Section 3.

2. SDP Goals and Organization: District Level

As reported by respondents to the interview questions, the universally cited goal of SDP in Benton Harbor is the improvement of student achievement (see Table 2). Other goals mentioned included:

-improvement in the overall cohesiveness of schools through improved interpersonal climate and management of school functions;

-improvement in student behavior, as demonstrated by fewer suspensions, less corporal punishment, better attendance and better interactions between students and teachers;

-improved social skills;

-increased parent involvement; and

-more in-service training for teachers and administrators.

These SDP goals were described as basically the same as overall district goals by most respondents, although some pointed out that SDP placed more emphasis on social skills. When asked how the program fits into the overall structure of the district, there was a general sense that specific SDP goals and procedures are gradually being incorporated into the system, but that work remains to be done to fully integrate the program into the larger system.

The SDP includes two levels of organization: the district and the school. At the district level, a number of central office administrators play key roles: The Superintendent's role is to set the tone and confirm the district's on-going commitment to program goals and high expectations. He helps to monitor program progress and assist in resolving problems of implementation. The SDP Director has the primary responsibility of coordinating and supervising all Program components, as well as representing the Program in district-wide planning and administrative decisions. She is responsible for budget management, in-service training and technical assistance to school personnel involved in the process. She also provides encouragement and helps solve planning and implementation problems which arise at the school or district level. The SDP Consultant also serves as an assistant to school personnel for implementing SDP components and a catalyst for initiating planning and implementation activities. District Directors of departments (such as Elementary Education, Personnel, Research, State and Federal Programs, Special Education, Staff Development and Reading) provide indirect support to schools to facilitate SDP activities. This role is especially true for the Director of Elementary Education, who works directly with principals and other school personnel to plan and implement the SDP in coordination with general school operations. Other district level personnel, such as social workers, psychologists, nurses and teacher consultants, may serve on SDP committees at the school level and thus assist in accomplishing specific SDP goals.

Information about SDP is disseminated at the central office level in several ways. The SDP Director sits on the superintendent's Management Team and Instructional Council and brings issues and concerns about SDP to

these bodies whenever necessary. Prior to the 1985-86 school year, the Urban Academy met on a regular basis and served as a way of disseminating information. In addition, written memos, reports and descriptive articles are prepared by the SDP Director to share information and suggestions for implementing SDP components. Periodic in-service training sessions are also used for disseminating information.

Information from the central office to the individual schools regarding SDP is disseminated primarily by the SDP Director and Consultant through written communications, in-service training sessions and informal consultation through participation on school committees. The Director of Elementary Education is also part of the dissemination process, working with school administrators and SDP committees to plan and carry out activities.

3. SDP Goals and Organization: School Level

As discussed above, individual schools were selected to be part of the School Development Program primarily because of their students' low achievement scores and high level of behavior problems, as well as the desire of individual principals to have their schools involved. Although many of the school personnel and parents who were included in our interviews did not know the specific reasons why their school was involved, most cited a general need to improve the climate and student performance in their school as the probable reasons.

The goals for SDP cited by school-level participants were very similar to those mentioned by central office personnel (see Table 3). Of the 33 school-level respondents, 19 (58%) included improved student achievement as a goal, 12 (36%) listed increased parent involvement, 8 (24%) mentioned improved social skills or student behavior and 8 (24%) cited improvement

in the overall school environment.

To reach these goals, each school organized its implementation of SDP by establishing three basic components:

a. the School Advisory Council (SAC): which includes the principal, one or two teacher representatives, one or two parent representatives, and representatives of other school personnel such as psychologists, social workers or others;

b. the Parents Program: both paid and volunteer parents working as classroom aides to assist teachers in a variety of activities;

c. the Support Team (originally called the Mental Health Team): which includes the principal, one or two teachers, one or two parents, the psychologist, social worker and nurse, and sometimes a teacher consultant.

Most school-level respondents also identified the SDP Director or Consultant as also being a member of their SAC and/or Support Team. Several people indicated that the entire staff are actually participants in the SDP components in one way or another.

When asked to specify which components are currently functioning in their schools, most respondents, from all seven schools, stated that these three basic components are all being implemented at the present time. Some respondents also listed specific activities -- such as student field trips, social skills curriculum projects, or a gymnastics team -- as key components of SDP which were functioning in their buildings.

Current participants in these components are similar to those identified above: the SAC's include the principal, 1-3 teachers, 1-3 parents, 1-2 representatives from the Support Team and often a member of the central SDP staff; the Parent Programs include varying numbers of

parents; and the Support Teams include the principal, psychologist, social worker, nurse, central office SDP representative and sometimes a central office teacher consultant.

4. SDP Training

As described above, the SDP Director received a 9-month training program in New Haven to prepare her for her role as change agent/facilitator of the local district's SDP activities. A second component of the SDP training for Benton Harbor was a 4-week training program in New Haven for another administrator to prepare her for a role of assisting the local SDP Director. This second component was an abbreviated version of the earlier program, with both theoretical and practical aspects of SDP addressed through discussions, seminars and in-school activities at New Haven SDP schools already involved in the process.

A third training component took place during the summer and fall of 1984, when two groups of Benton Harbor administrators visited New Haven. This component included discussions with several key New Haven Public Schools SDP participants, as well as in-depth discussions with Dr. Comer regarding the background and implementation process of SDP in New Haven and Benton Harbor. The first group, which came during July, participated in a conference on "effective schools" sponsored by the Connecticut State Department of Education. Because this training visit took place during the summer, the group was not able to visit New Haven SDP schools.

B. Perceptions Analysis

The second form of analysis used in this process study of Benton Harbor's SDP, the perceptions analysis, describes the implementation process through the eyes of the 46 participants who were interviewed.

When analyzing the results of a small study such as this (with a sample of less than 100), it must be stated that the results are generally considered less than meaningful in a statistical sense. However, the perceptions expressed and the percentages indicated for each area can indeed be meaningful for understanding how the program is functioning and how it can be strengthened in the future.

1. Central Office Personnel

a. SDP Goals

Perceptions among central office personnel as to whether the goals of SDP are consistent with the overall goals of the school district were varied. Most respondents gave a qualified "yes," although several pointed out that a distinction must be made between "stated goals" and goals which are implied by strategies and decisions made on a day-to-day basis, between the "formal" and the "informal" goals. Examples of statements made include:

> "I recognize that this program is a change in the traditional way of operating schools, which means that...it cannot be assumed that because you have the goals that they can be immediately and successfully implemented."
>
> "I think the formally stated [district] goals are consistent. [with SDP goals].
> However, the day-to-day operations are quite contrary to the school development process."
>
> "We are all heading in the same direction, and if we can get past our little problems...and let the right hand know what the left hand is doing, there

is hope for this [SDP] to work."

b. Incorporation of SDP into District Functions

Similar to the range of perceptions regarding the compatibility of SDP and district goals, perceptions regarding how well SDP functions have been incorporated into the district's regular operations were mixed. As stated by one respondent, "SDP is still viewed more as an appendage than a vital part of district activities." Other statements were:

> "I don't think it [SDP] fits in well enough. It's kind of a piece of the puzzle, but the puzzle isn't really working together."
>
> "I think we are moving toward the possibility of the central administrators seeing it as a key component."
>
> "[SDP] has become a basic management system for the schools using the various components."
>
> "I see it as an integral part of the support system [in each building]."

c. Progress of SDP in the District

Most central office personnel could cite at least one or two areas in which they feel that the SDP is indeed making progress toward achieving its goals. The two most frequently mentioned areas of improvement were (1) student achievement and (2) general attitudes toward the program and its mission.

Also mentioned were: more positive attitudes of staff personnel toward students and better parent participation.

Areas identified as still needing improvement were: "trust" and "communications," as well as the problem of a feeling among some school personnel and parents that this program -- like others before it -- is

"just temporary" and that they therefore do not need to pay much attention to it.

Nearly all respondents felt that it would be unrealistic to expect <u>everyone</u> to be enthusiastic about changes in the schools, that changes were taking place slowly as more and more people saw that SDP is indeed permanent and helpful, and that different schools are making different rates of progress because of their individual differences of personnel and students.

Some of the statements used to describe the overall progress of SDP in the district were:

> "I think we have made considerable achievement... we are beginning to have a little more consideration for each other and for the children."
>
> "I think there has been steady progress. [But] I think there is a long, long way to go."
>
> "There are some schools that are really moving toward the goal successfully. There are others that are slower paced that seem not to be as goal directed."
>
> "I think there is progress because...I have noticed a difference in how the schools work after they have had the whole program in place."
>
> "The SDP schools are making the greatest [test] score gains...Parents are buying into the school system...We have cut down considerably on the number of discipline reports."

2. School Personnel and Parents

Perceptions of school personnel and parents are divided into four general areas: (a) the changes they perceive to have taken place in thier schools because of their SDP involvement, (b) the impact these changes have had on the schools, (c) obstacles in the way of achieving progress toward SDP goals, and (d) perceptions of the roles they each play in the SDP process.

a. School Level Changes Due to SDP

When asked what programs within their schools could be attributed 100% to SDP, a wide variety of responses were given, including:

- field trips, candy sales, Christmas dinner, grandparent day, ice cream social;
- social skills projects in the classrooms, gymnastics class, fourth grade recognition program;
- Discovery Room, getting parents and teachers to work together, getting more equipment in the classrooms;
- improving students' cafeteria behavior;
- getting more in-service (training) for teachers;
- improving the school climate, cultural activities, a unit on Michigan history;
- community groups adopting a school.

Estimates ranged from "none" to "80% or more" of all special programs viewed as having been initiated by SDP planning. Even within the same school, opinions varied considerably as to what impact SDP was having on

school functions.

Similarly, when asked "How much of what was done in the school before the SDP model was initiated has changed as a result of SDP?", answers covered a wide range, including:

- most things;
- nothing;
- better parent involvement, better communication and cooperation, more teamwork;
- more resources available, more positive attitudes toward the students and fellow staff members;
- a new process for handling problems, a more concrete way to plan for our school;
- more active PTO;
- better teacher morale.

However, when asked what things had not changed, in spite of the presence of SDP in their buildings, most respondents could think of very few aspects of school functions that had not changed. The only two areas mentioned more than once were student behavior/discipline (mentioned by 5 people) and general teacher attitudes (4 people).

b. Impact of SDP on Schools

As described above (see Page 8), the goals of SDP identified by school-level personnel and parents included improvements in academic achievement, student behavior and social skills, school climate and parentinvolvement. Respondents were asked to discuss the progress made in their respective schools toward meeting the first three of these goals, as well as a fourth area, teacher morale (see Table 4).

The area in which the highest percentage perceive a positive impact of

the program is that of school climate. Seventeen of the 33 respondents (52%) feel that their school climate has improved, nine (27%) feel that the climate has stayed the same and none feel that the climate has gotten worse. Some (21%) had no opinion. (It should be pointed out that in many instances the respondents who offered no opinion about these areas were the parents, who have less direct involvement in the day-to-day operation of the schools.)

The impact on student achievement was viewed as: Improved, 45%; The Same, 30%; Worse 0%; No Opinion, 24%. The area of teacher morale was perceived as: Better, 39%; The Same, 33%; Worse, 6%; and No Opinion, 21%. The two people who thought teacher morale was worse cited the reason that some teachers were frustrated about the gap between actual program accomplishments thus far and the changes they had hoped would take place. They both also felt that a number of teachers were uncomfortable with and upset about carrying out their tasks with parent aides in the classroom.

In the fourth area, student behavior, 36% felt that SDP had helped improve conditions, 36% felt that there had been no change and 27% had no opinion.

c. Obstacles

Respondents cited a number of obstacles which initially impeded progress toward reaching the SDP goals and, in most cases, continued to be somewhat of a problem (see Table 5). The most frequently mentioned (21%) was a general resistance to change among the staff of their respective schools. The second most often mentioned was a perception that procedures and expectations were unclear (18%), although several people mentioned that this problem was being eliminated as more program involvement takes place. Five of the 33 people (15%) mentioned that teachers at their

schools were by and large uneasy with having parents involved in their classrooms. Three people (9%) felt that an obstacle was the reluctance of parents to become active in school activities. Other issues mentioned included: general staff apathy and frustration with being asked to do new procedures, budget cuts which reduced parent stipend funds, staff changes, busy schedules, general problems with student behavior and simply not having enough time in the program yet to make the necessary process changes. Five of the respondents did not know of any specific obstacles to program implementation at their schools.

d. Role Perceptions

Principals mainly viewed their roles as facilitators of the SDP process within their buildings.

> "I see myself as the facilitator, both by way of providing resources, as well as being knowledgeable myself in order to provide guidance--both direct and indirect."
>
> "I see my role as to keep us 'on track' in terms of the process."
>
> "I am sort of the 'maestro'...to get a balance between everyone so that we are all working for the same goal."

Several principals also mentioned their role as mediators between various individuals or groups within their school, "...to help them see both sides [of an issue] so that then we can go ahead and do what's best for the building."

Teachers and parents by and large merely indicated what official role they played, such as being a member of a SAC or a Support Team.

3. Assessment of SDP Training

As discussed above, there have been three components of SDP training offered to Benton Harbor participants. The first was the comprehensive, 9-month training program in New Haven for the SDP Director. The second was the 4-week training experience in New Haven for the SDP Consultant and the third component was the 3-day visit in New Haven of key SDP school administrators.

Assessments of all three training components were quite positive, although part of the third group was limited in its direct contact with New Haven's SDP implementation process since the schools were not in session at the time of their visit. Participants felt that the selection of people to visit New Haven was reasonable, if not broad-based, because those chosen were the administrators who were expected to serve as building-level or district facilitators of the program and therefore needed the most exposure to it.

The most valuable aspect of the training was unanimously identified as the meetings held with Dr. Comer to discuss the background and suggested implementation strategies of the program. Several trainees voiced disappointment that their visit had been planned during summer vacation and they thus were not able to observe the schools in action or discuss SDP with their New Haven counterparts. It is this aspect that all trainees suggested should be changed for future training trips. In spite of this limitation, however, most trainees indicated that their expectations had been at least partically met by the training experience.

VI. Summary

This Process Narrative Report has attempted to present both a description of how the School Development Program is being implemented in

Benton Harbor and the perceptions of this implementation process held by a number of participants. Information and perceptions were provided by 46 people who were interviewed during May of 1986.

The predominant attitude about the SDP seems to be one of cautious optimism. Most respondents expressed their personal commitment to the goals of the program and their general understanding and acceptance of the process by which to achieve those goals. Yet, there was also a lingering attitude of disappointment expressed by several people, a sense of frustration that the program has not been able to accomplish as much as had been hoped at its inception. Perceived reasons for this limited success generally revolved around the realities of size, complexity and inertia which often characterize institutions such as schools or school districts. Many people in the study simply pointed to a tendency of human beings to resist change and hold on to comfortable (if less than successful) routines.

There is a general perception that student achievement is improving, school climates are becoming more positive, parents and teachers are finding more avenues of communication and the decision-making processes are becoming more democratic in SDP schools. However slowly, progress <u>is</u> being made.

APPENDIX

A. Interview Protocols

B. Tables

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

For Central Office Personnel

1. When was the School Development Model introduced into the Benton Harbor Area School system?

2. Why do you think the model was introduced?

3. What do you think are the stated short term and long term goals of the SDP?

4. What criteria were used to select the 10 schools that are currently using this model?

5. How were the criteria established?

6. What process was used to identify which schools met the established criteria?

7. What were the general demographic characteristics of the seven schools at the time of their selection?

8. Have the demographic characteristics of the seven schools changed over the past year? If so, in what way?

9. What is your role in the SDP process?

10. How is information about SDP being disseminated among the Central Office personnel?

11. What is the role of the Central Office in disseminating information about SDP to the schools and community? Who are the key individuals and how is dissemination taking place?

12. How do components of SDP (School Advisory Committee [SAC], Support Team Staff [STS], SST's, Social Calendar, etc.) get organized and implemented at the school level? Who takes the lead? What is the role of the Central Office?

13. What do you perceive to be the role of the School Development Program in the overall structure of your district's school system?

14. What do you perceive to be the current goals of SDP? How do these goals coincide with or vary from the overall goals of the school system?

15. What progress do you feel is being made toward the accomplishment of the SDP goals?

For School Personnel and Parents

1. How was your school selected to become an SDP school and when did you first begin using this model?

2. How did SDP get started in your school, that is, what activities were first to be initiated?

3. Who was involved in these initial activities?

4. What were some of the obstacles to getting started and how were the obstacles overcome?

5. What do you consider to be the short and long term goals of the SDP?

6. Which SDP components are currently functioning in your school?

7. Please describe the people involved in each component and how it functions.

8. What is your current role in the SDP process?

9. How many of the 'special' programs or activities in your school may be attributed 100% to SDP? Please identify these.

10. How much of what was done in the school before the SDP model was instituted has changed as a result of SDP? Please give examples if you can.

11. How much of what was done before has not changed in any way despite the presence of SDP? Please give some examples.

12. Can you please give me your general impressions about how well the SDP is functioning in your school in terms of its overall contribution to the follows:

(1) school climate:
(2) student behavior:
(3) teacher morale:
(4) student achievement:

For Trainees

1. Would you say that the individuals who were selected were representative of all levels of administrative and professional staff in the school system? Please elaborate.

2. How were the decisions made about who should visit New Haven?

3. What were the most valuable aspects of the training you received while in New Haven?

4. What were the least valuable aspects of the training you received while in New Haven?

5. How useful was each of the following activities during training in helping you to better understand the model?

	Not Useful	Fairly Useful	Very Useful	Not Applic.
Workshops at Child Study Center				
Meeting with parents				
School visits overall				
Sitting in on S.A.C. meetings				
Sitting in on Support Team Staff meetings				
Talking with principals				
Talking with teachers				
Talking with other school staff				
Observing classroom activity				
Talking with Central Office personnel				
Other (Specify) _____				

6. Before coming to New Haven, what were your expectations of the training you would receive and were these expectations <u>met</u>, <u>not met</u>, or <u>exceeded</u>? Please elaborate.

7. How should training have been different to have been more useful? (For example, were there activities that were not included which should have been? Or activities included which should have bene omitted? Were the meeting places comfortable and conducive to meaningful interaction?)

8. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1=very poor and 5=excellent, how would you evaluate the total training experience?

9. Since returning to Benton Harbor from New Haven, have you shared your experience with other? [If yes] With whom and how did you go about this sharing?

TABLE 1

Benton Harbor Process Study Sample

Central Office Personnel

1. Superintendent
2. SDP Director
3. SDP Consultant
4. Director of Elementary Education
5. Director of Research
6. Director of Personnel
7. Director of Special Education
8. Director of State and Federal Programs
9. Director of Reading
10. Coordinator of Staff Development
11. Social Worker
12. School Nurse
13. Teacher Consultant

School Personnel and Parents

	Principal	Teachers	Parents	Other Staff	
Hull	X	2	2	--	
Martindale	X[a]	2	1	--	
Bard	X[a]	3	1	--	
Calvin Britain	X	2	1	1	
Morton	X	2	1	1	
East	X	2	1	1	
Sterne Brunson	X	3	1	--	
	6	16	8	3	Total=33

[a]Joint position

Table 2

SDP Goals: Central Office Personnel (N=13)

Goal	Frequency	%
Improved student achievement	13	100.0
Improved student behavior	4	30.8
Improved school climate and management	5	38.5
More parent involvement	2	15.4
More in-service training	2	15.4

Table 3

SDP Goals: School Personnel and Parents (N=33)

Goal	Frequency	%
Improved student achievement	19	57.6
More parent involvement	12	36.4
Improved student behavior and social skills	8	24.2
Improved school climate	8	24.2
Improved staff skills and morale	2	6.1
More broad-based school management	2	6.1
More community involvement	2	6.1

Table 4

Perceptions of SDP Impact:
School Personnel and Parents (N=33)

	Better	Same	Worse	No Opinion
School Climate	17(52%)	9(27%)	0	7 (21%)
Student Achievement	15(45%)	10(30%)	0	8 (24%)
Teacher Morale	13(39%)	11(33%)	2(6%)	7 (21%)
Student Behavior	12(36%)	12(36%)	0	9 (27%)

Table 5

Perceived Obstacles to SDP:
School Personnel and Parents (N=33)

	Frequency	%
General resistance to any change	7	21.2
Unclear expectations	6	18.2
Negative feelings about parent involvement	5	15.2
Parent reluctance to being involved	3	9.1
Staff apathy/frustration	2	6.1
Too little time to achieve objectives	2	6.1
Staff changes	1	3.0
Budget cuts	1	3.0
Student behavior	1	3.0
No opinion	5	15.2